



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,338	01/26/2004	Christopher Clemmett Macleod Beck	P8600	9881
24739 7590 04/28/2011 CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC 3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D WATSONVILLE, CA 95076				
EXAMINER				
CHEEMA, UMAR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2444				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/28/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

officeactions@CENTRALCOASTPATENT.COM

plambuth@centralcoastpatent.com

anantha@formulateip.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/765,338

Applicant(s)

MACLEOD BECK ET AL.

Examiner

UMAR CHEEMA

Art Unit

2444

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40-42, 46-53, 70-72 and 75-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-42, 46-53, 70-72 and 75-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 02/02/2011. Claims 40-42, 46-53, 70-72, and 75-82 are pending in this action. Claims 40 and 70 are being further amended.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 02/02/2011, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 40-42, 46-53, 70-72, and 75-82 under 102 (b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made Parekh et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0215630 in view of Smith et al. (hereinafter Smith) (US Patent No. 6,594,673) and further in view of Hasan et al. (hereinafter Hasan) (US Pub. No. 2003/0110262).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 40-42, 47, 49-53, 70-72, and 75, 76, 78, 79, 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh et al. (hereinafter Parekh) (US Pub. No. 2004/0215630) in view of Smith et al. (hereinafter Smith) (US Patent No. 6,594,673) and further in view of Hasan et al. (hereinafter Hasan) (US Pub. No. 2003/0110262).

4. As to claims 40 and 70, Parekh discloses a communication management system and method, comprising: a computer appliance associated with a particular user (see at least abstract, paragraph (0017) Fig. 2; a policy enforcement device (202)); a data repository coupled to the computer appliance storing a directory of contact identities (see at least paragraph (0038), Fig. 2, database (204) which contains (customers, resources, policies)); a zone manager (i.e. 212) (resource manager) (Fig. 2) enabling the user to create one or more zones defined each by a business or a social activity (see at least paragraph (009, 0032, 0034), Fig. 1, RSP (102) with sub customers TSP1, TSP2, EC1 and TSP1 with further branches etc.), and to create management policies associated with and specific to each zone created (see at least paragraphs (0036, 0037), RSP and TSP then control their immediate customers by implementing policies and allocating resources to their immediate customers, further the attributes of the resources can be number of rules, the number of IP addresses and the bandwidth etc.); and an identity/zone firewall acting as an enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway at the computer appliance through which incoming and outgoing communications pass (see at least paragraph (0045, 0058, 0059), Figures 4a and 4b, tables 1 and 2 and related details).

5. Although, Parekh discloses the substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Parekh fails to expressly disclose: wherein creating one or more zones are defined by a business or a social activity; and associate specific contact identities with individual ones of the zones created. Nevertheless, these features were well known in the art at the time of present invention.

6. In analogous teaching, Smith exemplifies this wherein Smith teaches: creating one or more zones are defined by a business or a social activity; and associate specific contact identities

with individual ones of the zones created (see Smith at least abstract, Fig. 4, 5 and details; wherein an interactive collaborative information system creating and link information such as emails, bulletin boards, chats, politics, and other activities etc.).

7. Thus given the teaching of Smith, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill person in the art of networking to combine the teaching of Parekh into Smith for creating social or business zones. Motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to more easily find other users with the same interested.

8. Although, Parekh-Smith discloses the substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Parekh further fails to expressly disclose: wherein firewall acting as an enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway is, at the computer appliance through which incoming and outgoing communications; and wherein individual incoming or outgoing communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass.

9. In analogous teaching, Hasan exemplifies this wherein Hasan teaches: wherein firewall acting as an enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway is, at the computer appliance through which incoming and outgoing communications; and wherein individual incoming or outgoing communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass (see Hasan: at least paragraphs (0086, 0103, 0129, 0132, 0136), Figures 1 and 9B).

10. Thus given the teaching of Hasan, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill person in the art of networking to combine the teaching of Parekh-Smith into Hasan for firewall acting as a management policy enforcer. Motivation for doing so would have been to make user created zones more secure by having individual security parameters.

11. As to claim 41, Parekh-Smith disclose wherein Smith further discloses the system of claim 40 wherein contact identities may be names or aliases of person or devices (see Smith at least abstract, Fig. 4, 5 and details).

12. As to claim 42, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising an interface to a network, wherein the communication involves sending or receiving message over the network (see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)).

13. As to claims 43-45, (Cancelled).

14. As to claim 47, Parekh disclose the system of claim 40 wherein contact identities of single users or devices may vary by communication mode as well as by zone (see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)).

15. As to claim 49, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 wherein contact identities include both sender and recipients (see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)).

16. As to claim 50, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising generated alerts from attempted policy violation (see at least paragraph (0045, 0058, 0059)).

17. As to claim 51, Parekh discloses the system of claim 41 wherein contact identity name may be in a form of a URI, an email address, a telephone number, a machine address, an IP address, or a text message (see at least paragraphs (0036, 0037)).

18. As to claim 52, the combination of Parekh-Hasan discloses the system of claim 40 wherein management policy includes automatic handling of incoming communication events, the handling determined by one or both of contact identity and mode of communication (see Parekh: paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059) and Hasan: at least paragraphs (0148)).

19. As to claim 53, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising an interactive user interface for a user to create and populate zones, enter contact identities and create, edit, and associate policy (see at least paragraphs (0029, 0032, 0048)).

20. As to claims 54-69, 73 and 74, (Cancelled).

21. As to claims 71-72 and 75-76, 78, 79, 81 and 82, there claimed limitations are same as previously addressed claims 41-42, and 47, 49-53 except being method claims and therefore are rejected for the same rationale as 41-42, and 47, 49-53.

22. Claims 46, 48, 77 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh-Smith-Hasan and further in view of Pounds et al . (hereinafter Pounds) (US Patent No. 6,560,222).

23. As to claim 46, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 wherein messaging in multiple modes and protocols is supported, including but not limited to voice and text (see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0088)) but fails to expressly disclose wherein messaging can be voice and text. In analogous teaching Pounds teaches: wherein messaging can be voice and text (see Pounds: at least abstract, col. 5, lines 57-63; enabling voice, data, video, and other communications to occur in an efficient and integrated manner) for the motivation of allocating and utilizing available communications sources.

24. As to claim 48, the combination of Parekh-Pounds disclose wherein the system of claim 46 wherein the multiple modes and protocols include email, instant messaging, RSS, voice mode, network-news transport protocol (NNTP), file transport protocol (FTP), really simple syndication (RSS), universal discovery_ description and integration (UDDI), lightweight directory_ access protocol (LDAP), multipurpose internet mail extensions (MIME, post office protocol (POP), simple mail transport protocol (SMTP), Internet message access protocol (IMAP), session initiation protocol (SIP), text messaging services (TMS), and hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) (see at least Parekh: paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088) and Pounds: col. 40, lines 1-34).

25. As to claims 77 and 80, there claimed limitations are same as previously addressed claims 46 and 48 except being method claims and therefore are rejected for the same rational.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to UMAR CHEEMA whose telephone number is (571)270-3037. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Jr. Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/U. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/Peling A Shaw/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Application/Control Number: 10/765,338
Art Unit: 2444

Page 9